

6236747). Claims 8, 30, and 61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Liu in view of Ye and King, further in view of Svetkoff (US 5617209). Claims 32 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Liu in view of Ye, King, and Svetkoff, further in view of Roy (US 6118540). These rejections are respectfully traversed based on the following arguments.

In order for a patent claim to be obvious, the prior art must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claim. That is because the claim must be considered as a whole; it may not be distilled down to a gist.

Independent method claim 1 recites the limitation

disposing a sensor, a first optical element and a second optical element in relation to the ball array device so that the sensor obtains at least two differing views of the at least one ball

at lines 6-9. Independent method claims 24, 48, 69, and 70 each recite similar limitations.

None of the prior art disclose or suggest such an action. They do suggest obtaining only a single view using a sensor. They also suggest obtaining two differing views using two different sensors. However, considered together the prior art references do not teach or suggest that a sensor be used to obtain at least two differing views. The Ye article shows only a single view by a camera. The King reference shows only a single

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
Appln. No. 09/844,626

PATENT APPLICATION

view by a camera. The Svetkoff reference shows two views being obtained, each view obtained by a different sensor. The Roy reference shows only a single view by a camera. The Liu reference shows two views being obtained, each view obtained by a different sensor.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-88.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 24, 48, 69, and 70 are patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-23, 25-47, 49-68, and 71-88 are patentable as being dependent from patentable independent claims, and are further patentable due to the additional limitations recited therein.


For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance with claims 1-88. If there remain any issues that may be disposed of via a telephonic interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
Appln. No. 09/844,626

PATENT APPLICATION

The Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees, and conversely, deposit any credit balance, to Deposit Account No. 18-1579.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin L. PONTIUS
Reg. No. 37512
(505) 922-1400

ROBERTS ABOKHAIR &
MARDULA, LLC
11800 SUNRISE VALLEY DR.
SUITE 1000
RESTON, VA 20191